

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 15, 2004, considered claims 45 and 47-70. Claims 45, 56 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 45 and 47-55 are rejected as being unpatentable over Usui (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,570) in view of Williams (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411). Claims 56-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Usui¹.

Summary of Usui

Usui is the primary references used by the Office Action to reject all of the claims. Usui teaches "an electronic program guide system having a storage means for storing a first electronic program guide of a first system and a second electronic program guide of a second system different than the first system and an integrating means for integrating the first and second electronic program guides" (Usui, Col. 2, lines 8-13).

Usui teaches that several connected devices may receive different EPG data in different formats. For example, the IRD 4 of Usui (See Figure 1 of Usui) receives EPG data from an MPEG video satellite broadcast (see Usui, Col. 4, lines 12-13, and Col. 5, lines 44-56). A TV receiver 5 (see also Figure 1 of Usui) receives VHF transmissions and extracts the EPG from the Vertical Blanking Interval (VBI) of the transmission (see Usui, Col. 7, lines 38-47).

Usui then describes two alternative paths that may be used to store the EPG data from the IRD 4 and TV receiver 5 into the EPG receiver. One is described with respect to Figure 7 (hereinafter referred to as "the Figure 7 method"). According to the Figure 7 method, once the EPG receiver 6 receives the EPG data from one of the devices (see Usui, Col. 9, lines 7-9), the

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

EPG data may be stored according to conditions specified by the user (see Usui, Col. 9, lines 21-44). This may be repeated for another piece of equipment (see Usui, Col. 9, lines 45-46). The Figure 7 method thus involves conditioning of EPG data prior to storage in an EPG receiver 6.

The Office Action indicates that Column 9, lines 10-20 of Usui teach various parameters that may be used by a user to specify conditions. Particularly, the Office Action states that this passage teaches that program names or services, broadcast times, and broadcast channels may be used to specify conditions. However, while the passage does teach about conditional storing of EPG data (see Usui Column 9, lines 10-13), the passage does not teach how the conditioning may be specified. The reference to "broadcast channels, transponder names, program names and broadcasting times" (Usui, Column 9, lines 18-19) is merely to list the minimum items of EPG data that is to be stored when no condition is specified (see Usui, Column 9, lines 13-16).

Summary of Williams

Williams teaches a method and apparatus for compiling a repository of entertainment system data from multiple sources (Williams, title). Williams teaches that "entertainment system data from multiple sources [may be] combined and stored in a sourceless format" (Williams, Col. 10, lines 61-62). However, even if this entertainment data is taken to be EPG data, which the Applicants do not concede, Williams does not teach that this combined entertainment data is subject to user-specified conditions.

Claims

In stark contrast, each of the independent claims is now amended to recite that scaling is performed "wherein EPG data corresponding to more impending broadcasts times is richer than EPG data corresponding to less impending broadcast times." This feature is supported in the present specification in Figure 1 and the corresponding description. This feature is not described

or suggested by Usui and Williams, either singly or in combination. The dependent claims are patentable at least based on dependency from their corresponding independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections is respectfully requested. The 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection is rendered moot by the amendments to the claims, and thus also should be withdrawn.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 27th day of April 2004.

Respectfully submitted,



ADRIAN J. LEE
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913